arXiv:1205.6814v1 [hep-th] 30 May 2012

Area products for black hole horizons

Matt Visser

School of Mathematics, Statistics, and Operations Research,
Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand

E-mail: matt.visser@msor.vuw.ac.nz

Abstract: Area products for multi-horizon black holes often have intriguing properties, and are often independent of the mass of the black hole (depending only on various charges, angular momenta, and moduli). Such products are often formulated in terms of the areas of inner (Cauchy) horizons and event horizons, and often include the effects of unphysical "virtual" horizons. For the Schwarzschild–de Sitter [Kottler] black hole in (3+1) dimensions it is shown by explicit exact calculation that the product of event horizon area and cosmological horizon area is *not* mass independent. (Including the effect of the third "virtual" horizon does not improve the situation.) Similarly, in the Reissner–Nordstrom-anti-de Sitter black hole in (3+1) dimensions the product of inner (Cauchy) horizon area and event horizon area is calculated (perturbatively), and is shown to be *not* mass independent. That is, the mass-independence of the product of physical horizon areas is *not* generic. In the generic situation, whenever the quasi-local mass $m(r)$ is a Laurent polynomial in aerial radius, $r = \sqrt{A/4\pi}$, there are more complicated mass-independent quantities, the elementary symmetric polynomials built up from the complete set of horizon radii (physical *and* virtual). Sometimes it is possible to eliminate the unphysical virtual horizons, constructing combinations of physical horizon areas that are mass independent, but they tend to be considerably more complicated than the simple products and related constructions currently mooted in the literature.

31 May 2012; LaTeX-ed March 6, 2013

Keywords: horizon areas; event horizons; Cauchy horizons; cosmological horizons; Schwarzschild–de Sitter black holes; Schwarzschild-anti-de Sitter black holes; Reissner–Nordström–de Sitter black holes; Reissner–Nordström-anti-de Sitter black holes; 3+1 dimensions.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Schwarzschild–de Sitter black holes **2**
- 2.1 Killing horizons 3
- 2.2 Mass independence 4

3 Schwarzschild-anti-de Sitter black holes **4**

4 Reissner–Nordström–de Sitter black holes **5**
- 4.1 Approximate results 6
  - 4.1.1 Event and Cauchy horizons 6
  - 4.1.2 Cosmological horizon 7
  - 4.1.3 Virtual horizon 7
- 4.2 Exact results 8

5 Reissner–Nordström-anti-de Sitter black holes **9**
- 5.1 Approximate results 9
- 5.2 Exact results 10

6 Laurent polynomial for the quasi-local mass **11**

7 Discussion **13**

A Cubic polynomial equations **14**

1 Introduction

There has recently been some interest in the products of horizon areas for various types of black hole [1–7]. In some cases the product of horizon areas is in fact independent of the mass of the black hole. For instance, in the (3+1) dimensional Kerr–Newman black hole the product of inner [Cauchy] horizon area and event horizon areas is [1–7]:

$$A_C\, A_E = (8\pi)^2 \left[J^2 + \frac{Q^4}{4} \right]. \tag{1.1}$$

There are also a number of multi-dimensional string-inspired black hole configurations for which similar formulae hold [5, 6].[1] But how generic are such mass-independence results? (For instance, to what extent do they survive introduction of a cosmological constant?) Herein we exhibit several simple (3+1) dimensional examples where, due precisely to a non-zero cosmological constant, the product of physical horizon areas is explicitly *not* mass independent. There will typically be *some* (sometimes several) more complicated functions of physical horizon areas that are mass independent, but generically these functions are nowhere near as straightforward as a simple product of areas.

As we shall soon see, obtaining mass independent functions of horizon areas in spherical symmetry is intimately related to the Hawking–Israel/ Hernandez–Misner/ Misner–Sharp quasi-local mass $m(r)$ being a Laurent polynomial of the areal radius r defined by $A(r) = 4\pi r^2$. The relevant mass independent functions are constructed in terms of the elementary symmetric polynomials built up from the radii of the various horizons (physical *and* virtual). Sometimes one can eliminate the virtual horizons to obtain more complicated mass-independent qualities depending only on the physical horizons.

2 Schwarzschild–de Sitter black holes

For Schwarzschild–de Sitter [Kottler] black holes the Killing horizons are found by solving the equation

$$\Delta(r) = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

This is equivalent to solving the cubic

$$r^3 - 3r/\Lambda + 6m/\Lambda = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

---

[1] More boldly, there are also conjectures to the effect that this product of areas is sometimes quantized. That is: $A_C\; A_E = (8\pi)^2\; N$ with $N \in \mathbb{Z}$. For specific discussion of potential pitfalls for such a conjecture see [7].

For $\Lambda > 0$ it is convenient to set $\Lambda = 1/a^2$, where a is (asymptotically) the spatial radius of curvature. Then

$$r^3 - 3ra^2 + 6ma^2 = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

The three *exact* roots for this cubic are (see appendix A)

$$r = 2a \sin\left(\frac{1}{3}\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{a}\right) + \epsilon\frac{2\pi}{3}\right); \qquad \epsilon \in \{0, \pm 1\}. \tag{2.4}$$

2.1 Killing horizons

The two physical roots are the event horizon at

$$r_E = 2a \sin\left(\frac{1}{3}\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{a}\right)\right) = 2m + \frac{8m^3}{3a^3} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^5}{a^4}\right), \tag{2.5}$$

and the cosmological horizon at

$$r_\Lambda = 2a \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{3} + \frac{1}{3}\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{a}\right)\right) = \sqrt{3}a - m + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^2}{a}\right). \tag{2.6}$$

There is a third (unphysical) “virtual” horizon which is located at negative r:

$$r_V = -r_\Lambda - r_E. \tag{2.7}$$

Note that the product of areas, $A_E \times A_\Lambda$, has no nice quantization features. Nor does it have any nice “independence of mass” features. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}
A_E \times A_\Lambda &= (16\pi a^2)^2 \sin^2\left(\frac{2\pi}{3} + \frac{1}{3}\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{a}\right)\right)\sin^2\left(\frac{1}{3}\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{a}\right)\right) && (2.8)\\
&= (8\pi a^2)^2 \left[\cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{3}\right) - \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{3} + \frac{2}{3}\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{a}\right)\right)\right]^2 && (2.9)\\
&= (8\pi a^2)^2 \left[\frac{1}{2} - \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{3} + \frac{2}{3}\sin^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{a}\right)\right)\right]^2 && (2.10)\\
&= (8\pi)^2 \left\{3m^2a^2 - 2\sqrt{3}m^3a + 6m^4 + \mathcal{O}(m^5/a)\right\}. && (2.11)
\end{aligned}$$

If one restricts attention to the two physical horizons at the two physical roots of the cubic then this is pretty much the best one can do. If one includes the effect of the virtual horizon r_V, as advocated in [5], then we have the exact results

$$r_V\; r_E\; r_\Lambda = -6ma^2; \qquad\qquad A_V\; A_E\; A_\Lambda = (4\pi)^3\; 36m^2a^4. \tag{2.12}$$

This is, however, explicitly mass dependent.

2.2 Mass independence

In counterpoint, note that there is an exact mass-independent quantity arising from a quadratic sum over all three roots of the cubic. Namely:

$$\sum_{i>j} r_i r_j = -3a^2. \tag{2.13}$$

That is

$$r_V\{r_E + r_\Lambda\} + r_E\, r_\Lambda = -3a^2, \tag{2.14}$$

whence

$$\{r_\Lambda + r_E\}^2 - r_\Lambda r_E = 3a^2, \tag{2.15}$$

and so

$$r_\Lambda^2 + r_E^2 + r_\Lambda r_E = 3a^2. \tag{2.16}$$

If one prefers to work in terms of areas one has

$$A_\Lambda + A_E + \sqrt{A_\Lambda A_E} = 12\pi a^2. \tag{2.17}$$

So there is certainly *some* function of physical horizon areas that is mass independent, but the function that exhibits mass independence is nowhere near a straightforward as a simple product of horizon areas.

3 Schwarzschild-anti-de Sitter black holes

For completeness we briefly mention the Schwarzschild-anti-de Sitter black hole. We now set $\Lambda = -1/|a|^2$, and determine the Killing horizons via the polynomial equation

$$r^3 + 3r|a|^2 - 6m|a|^2 = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

There is now only one physical root, only one physical horizon (an event horizon), located at

$$r_E = 2|a| \sinh\left(\frac{1}{3}\sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{3m}{|a|}\right)\right). \tag{3.2}$$

To make this fully explicit, in terms of Cardano's formulae one can rewrite this as

$$r_E = |a|\left\{\left[\sqrt{1+\frac{9m^2}{|a|^2}}+\frac{3m}{|a|}\right]^{1/3} - \left[\sqrt{1+\frac{9m^2}{|a|^2}}-\frac{3m}{|a|}\right]^{1/3}\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

There are now two unphysical virtual horizons at complex values of r_V and r_V^*. There is an exact result that

$$r_V\, r_V^*\, r_E = 6m|a|^2; \qquad A_V\, A_V^*\, A_E = (4\pi)^3\, 36 m^2 a^4. \tag{3.4}$$

This is again explicitly mass dependent. The mass-independent quantity constructed from the event horizon and two virtual horizons is now

$$\sum_{i>j} r_i r_j = 3|a|^2. \tag{3.5}$$

That is

$$r_E\{r_V + r_V^*\} + r_V\, r_V^* = 3|a|^2. \tag{3.6}$$

We can simplify this a little by noting that in this situation

$$r_E + r_V + r_V^* = 0 \tag{3.7}$$

so that

$$r_E^2 = r_V r_V^* - 3|a|^2; \qquad A_E = |A_V| - 12\pi|a|^2. \tag{3.8}$$

This is mass independent — but since $|A_V|$ is not directly observable, (and not calculable except by explicitly solving the cubic), the result is not particularly useful.

4 Reissner–Nordström–de Sitter black holes

The situation improves somewhat for Reissner–Nordström–de Sitter black holes. To locate the Killing horizons we need to find the roots of

$$\Delta(r) = 1 - \frac{2m}{r} + \frac{Q^2}{r^2} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 = 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Again setting $\Lambda = 1/a^2$, we now rearrange this to obtain the quartic

$$r^4 - 3r^2a^2 + 6mra^2 - 3Q^2a^2 = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Taking $\Lambda \to 0$, (corresponding to $a \to \infty$), gives the standard Reissner–Nordström geometry. Also, $Q \to 0$ gives the Schwarzschild–de Sitter [Kottler] solution previously considered. Let us now write the quartic as

$$r^4 - 3a^2\{r^2 - 2mr + Q^2\} = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

and reformulate this as

$$r^4 - 3a^2(r - r_+)(r - r_-) = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Here $r_\pm$ are the locations where the horizons would be in the limit where the cosmological constant is switched off ($\Lambda \to 0$, that is, $a \to \infty$). For simplicity we shall take $|Q| \le m$, so that the $r_\pm$ are guaranteed real. (There is no real point to considering the sub-case where $r_\pm$ are complex.)

4.1 Approximate results

While we know on general principles that the quartic appearing above has an exact solution, it can be more advantageous to perturbatively extract approximate solutions. First, rearrange the quartic to yield the exact equation

$$r = r_\pm + \frac{r^4}{3a^2(r - r_\mp)}. \tag{4.5}$$

We shall now solve this equation perturbatively.

4.1.1 Event and Cauchy horizons

To a first approximation for the event horizon we have

$$r_E \approx r_+ + \frac{r_+^4}{3a^2(r_+ - r_-)} = r_+ \left\{ 1 + \frac{r_+^3}{3a^2(r_+ - r_-)} \right\}. \tag{4.6}$$

For the inner (Cauchy) horizon we have

$$r_C \approx r_- - \frac{r_-^4}{3a^2(r_+ - r_-)} = r_- \left\{ 1 - \frac{r_-^3}{3a^2(r_+ - r_-)} \right\}. \tag{4.7}$$

Consequently

$$r_E \, r_C \approx r_+ \, r_- \left\{ 1 + \frac{r_+^3 - r_-^3}{3a^2(r_+ - r_-)} \right\}, \tag{4.8}$$

and so

$$r_E \, r_C \approx r_+ \, r_- \left\{ 1 + \frac{r_+^2 + r_+ r_- r_+ + r_-^2}{3a^2} \right\}. \tag{4.9}$$

But in terms of the mass and charge we know

$$r_\pm = m \pm \sqrt{m^2 - Q^2}, \tag{4.10}$$

whence

$$r_+ \, r_- = Q^2, \tag{4.11}$$

and

$$r_\pm^2 = 2m^2 - Q^2 \pm m\sqrt{m^2 - Q^2}, \tag{4.12}$$

so

$$r_+^2 + r_+ r_- + r_-^2 = 4m^2 - Q^2. \tag{4.13}$$

This implies

$$r_E \, r_C \approx Q^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{4m^2 - Q^2}{3a^2} \right\}, \tag{4.14}$$

which can also be written as

$$r_E\, r_C = Q^2 \left\{1 + \Lambda(4m^2 - Q^2) + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^2)\right\}. \tag{4.15}$$

Therefore

$$A_E\, A_C = 16\pi^2 Q^2 \left\{1 + 2\Lambda(4m^2 - Q^2) + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^2)\right\}, \tag{4.16}$$

which is certainly *not* mass independent. For completeness we also note

$$r_E + r_C \approx 2m + \frac{r_+^4 - r_-^4}{3a^2(r_+ - r_-)}, \tag{4.17}$$

which again is explicitly mass dependent.

4.1.2 Cosmological horizon

From the exact result

$$r^2 = 3a^2\, \frac{(r - r_+)(r - r_-)}{r^2}, \tag{4.18}$$

we have, as a zero order approximation,

$$r_\Lambda \approx \sqrt{3}a. \tag{4.19}$$

Therefore as a first order approximation

$$r_\Lambda \approx \sqrt{3}a \sqrt{\frac{(\sqrt{3}a - r_+)(\sqrt{3}a - r_-)}{3a^2}} \tag{4.20}$$

$$\approx \sqrt{3}a \left\{1 - \frac{r_+ + r_-}{2\sqrt{3}a}\right\} \tag{4.21}$$

$$= \sqrt{3}a \left\{1 - \frac{m}{\sqrt{3}a}\right\}. \tag{4.22}$$

So for the cosmological horizon

$$r_\Lambda \approx \sqrt{3}a - m. \tag{4.23}$$

Oddly enough the location of the cosmological horizon is to this order independent of the charge Q, but it does definitely depend on the mass m.

4.1.3 Virtual horizon

Finally, from the exact quartic, we know there is a (unphysical) virtual horizon at negative r:

$$r_V = -\{r_E + r_C + r_\Lambda\}. \tag{4.24}$$

So to a first approximation

$$r_V \approx -\sqrt{3}a - m. \tag{4.25}$$

4.2 Exact results

What quantities might actually be independent of m? From the exact quartic we know

$$r_V\, r_E\, r_C\, r_\Lambda = -3Q^2 a^2, \tag{4.26}$$

implying, in terms of physical horizons, that the quantity

$$\{r_E + r_C + r_\Lambda\}\, r_E\, r_C\, r_\Lambda = 3Q^2 a^2 \tag{4.27}$$

is strictly independent of m. But this looks nothing like the product of event and Cauchy horizon areas A_+A_-. Perhaps more promising is the exact condition

$$\sum_{i>j} r_i r_j = -3a^2. \tag{4.28}$$

That is

$$r_V\,\{r_E + r_C + r_\Lambda\} + r_E\,\{r_C + r_\Lambda\} + r_C\, r_\Lambda = -3a^2, \tag{4.29}$$

whence

$$\{r_E + r_C + r_\Lambda\}^2 - r_E\,\{r_C + r_\Lambda\} - r_C\, r_\Lambda = 3a^2, \tag{4.30}$$

so that

$$r_E^2 + r_C^2 + r_\Lambda^2 + r_E\, r_C + r_C\, r_\Lambda + r_\Lambda\, r_E = 3a^2. \tag{4.31}$$

We can furthermore eliminate explicit (though not implicit) occurrence of the cosmological constant by dividing these two exact results to get

$$\frac{\{r_E + r_C + r_\Lambda\}\, r_E\, r_C\, r_\Lambda}{r_E^2 + r_C^2 + r_\Lambda^2 + r_E r_C + r_C\, r_\Lambda + r_\Lambda\, r_E} = Q^2. \tag{4.32}$$

This is certainly mass independent, but is a rather complicated function of physical horizon radii. As $a \to \infty$ (that is $\Lambda \to 0$, so $r_\Lambda \to \infty$) one recovers the usual Reissner–Nordström result

$$\lim_{a\to\infty} r_E\, r_C = Q^2. \tag{4.33}$$

If one insists on working with areas then we have the exact result

$$\frac{\{\sqrt{A_E} + \sqrt{A_C} + \sqrt{A_\Lambda}\}\, \sqrt{A_E\, A_C\, A_\Lambda}}{A_E^2 + A_C^2 + A_\Lambda^2 + \sqrt{A_E A_C} + \sqrt{A_C\, A_\Lambda} + \sqrt{A_\Lambda\, A_E}} = 4\pi Q^2. \tag{4.34}$$

Again, there is certainly some function of physical horizon areas that is mass-independent, (and in this particular case even free of explicit cosmological constant dependence), but it is nowhere near as straightforward as a simple product of horizon areas.

5 Reissner–Nordström-anti-de Sitter black holes

We now have $\Lambda = -1/|a|^2$ and the relevant quartic becomes

$$r^4 + 3r^2|a|^2 - 6mr|a|^2 + 3Q^2|a|^2 = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

There are now two complex conjugate (unphysical) virtual horizons $r_V^\pm$, and two physical horizons: an event horizon r_E and an inner (Cauchy) horizon r_C. Because there are only two physical horizons, this particular situation is closest in spirit to the standard Reissner–Nordström spacetime.

5.1 Approximate results

To a first approximation, for the event horizon we have

$$r_E \approx r_+ - \frac{r_+^4}{3|a|^2(r_+ - r_-)} = r_+ \left\{ 1 - \frac{r_+^3}{3|a|^2(r_+ - r_-)} \right\}, \tag{5.2}$$

while for the inner [Cauchy] horizon we see

$$r_C \approx r_- + \frac{r_-^4}{3|a|^2(r_+ - r_-)} = r_- \left\{ 1 + \frac{r_-^3}{3|a|^2(r_+ - r_-)} \right\}, \tag{5.3}$$

and for the two unphysical virtual horizons we obtain

$$r_V^\pm \approx \pm i\sqrt{3}\,|a| - m. \tag{5.4}$$

Then it is easy to compute

$$r_E\, r_C \approx r_+\, r_- \left\{ 1 - \frac{r_+^3 - r_-^3}{3|a|^2(r_+ - r_-)} \right\}, \tag{5.5}$$

so that

$$r_E\, r_C \approx r_+\, r_- \left\{ 1 - \frac{r_+^2 + r_+ r_- r_+ + r_-^2}{3|a|^2} \right\}, \tag{5.6}$$

and so

$$r_E\, r_C \approx Q^2 \left\{ 1 - \frac{4m^2 - Q^2}{3|a|^2} \right\}. \tag{5.7}$$

Then, (and I again emphasize that for $\Lambda < 0$ we are in an asymptotically adS spacetime with no cosmological horizon, and we really only have these two physical horizons to deal with), we see

$$r_E\, r_C = Q^2 \left\{ 1 - |\Lambda|(4m^2 - Q^2) + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^2) \right\}. \tag{5.8}$$

In fact this now implies that for *either* sign of the cosmological constant one has

$$r_E\, r_C = Q^2 \left\{ 1 + \Lambda(4m^2 - Q^2) + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^2) \right\}. \tag{5.9}$$

Note this is very definitely *not* mass independent.

5.2 Exact results

Some exact results can again be obtained by computing various combinations of the roots of the quartic. Note that the key basic results obtained by picking off the various coefficients of the quartic are:

$$r_V^+ + r_V^- + r_C + r_E = 0; \tag{5.10}$$

$$r_V^+\, r_V^- + (r_V^+ + r_V^-)\,(r_C + r_E) = 3|a|^2; \tag{5.11}$$

$$r_V^+\, r_V^-\,(r_C + r_E) + (r_V^+ + r_V^-)\, r_C\, r_E = -6m|a|^2; \tag{5.12}$$

and

$$r_V^+\, r_V^-\, r_C\, r_E = 3Q^2|a|^2. \tag{5.13}$$

Therefore

$$(r_V^+ + r_V^-) = -(r_C + r_E); \qquad r_V^\pm = -\frac{1}{2}(r_C + r_E) \pm i\gamma, \tag{5.14}$$

and so

$$r_V^+\, r_V^- = 3|a|^2 + (r_C + r_E)^2; \tag{5.15}$$

$$(r_V^+\, r_V^- - r_C\, r_E)(r_C + r_E) = -6m|a|^2; \tag{5.16}$$

$$r_V^+ r_V^- = \frac{1}{4}(r_C + r_E)^2 + \gamma^2. \tag{5.17}$$

We can eliminate some of the unknowns in the above expressions but not all.
In particular

$$\frac{r_V^+ r_V^- r_C r_E}{r_V^+ r_V^- + (r_V^+ + r_V^-)(r_C + r_E)} = Q^2, \tag{5.18}$$

so

$$\frac{[\frac{1}{4}(r_C + r_E)^2 + \gamma^2] r_C r_E}{\gamma^2 - \frac{3}{4}(r_C + r_E)^2} = Q^2. \tag{5.19}$$

Unfortunately, while the RHS depends only on the charge Q, the LHS contains the free parameter γ which is not directly accessible to physical observation. (Nor is it easy to calculate without explicitly solving the quartic.) Alternatively, one could also write

$$\left\{3|a|^2 + (r_C + r_E)^2\right\} r_C r_E = 3Q^2|a|^2. \tag{5.20}$$

Therefore

$$\left\{1 + \frac{1}{3}|\Lambda|(r_C + r_E)^2\right\} r_C r_E = Q^2. \tag{5.21}$$

This is at least m independent, and γ independent, but explicitly contains both Q and Λ. If we work in terms of areas

$$\left\{1 + \frac{1}{12\pi}|\Lambda| \left(\sqrt{A_C} + \sqrt{A_E}\right)^2\right\} \sqrt{A_C A_E} = 4\pi Q^2. \tag{5.22}$$

Again, there is a function of physical horizon areas that is mass-independent, but it is nowhere near as straightforward as a simple product of horizon areas.

6 Laurent polynomial for the quasi-local mass

Let us now try to put these specific results into a broader context. Based only on spherical symmetry one can without any loss of generality write [8]

$$ds^2 = -\exp\{2\Phi(r)\}\left(1-\frac{2m(r)}{r}\right)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{1-2m(r)/r} + r^2\{d\theta^2+\sin^2\theta\,d\varphi^2\}. \tag{6.1}$$

Here the quantity $m(r)$ is the Hawking–Israel/Hernandez–Misner/Misner–Sharp quasi-local mass [9, 10], and $\Phi(r)$ is the anomalous redshift [8]. The Killing horizons are then found by solving

$$\Delta(r) \equiv 1 - \frac{2m(r)}{r} = 0. \tag{6.2}$$

Now suppose merely that $m(r)$ is some generic Laurent polynomial. Then without loss of generality $\Delta(r)$ can be written in the form

$$\Delta(r) = \Delta_*\,\frac{P(r)}{r^n}. \tag{6.3}$$

Here we have normalized the (ordinary) polynomial $P(r)$ so that its highest degree coefficient is unity, and its lowest degree coefficient (a constant term) is nonzero. The Killing horizons are located at the zeros r_i of the numerator $P(r)$. That is, we have

$$P(r) = \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} c_j\, r^j + r^D = \prod_{i=1}^{D}(r-r_i). \tag{6.4}$$

Furthermore, as is completely standard

$$c_0 = (-1)^D \prod_{i=1}^{D} r_i; \qquad c_1 = (-1)^{D-1}\sum_{j=1}^{D}\prod_{i=1, i\neq j}^{D} r_i; \quad \dots \tag{6.5}$$

$$\dots \quad c_{D-2} = \sum_{i>j} r_i r_j; \qquad c_{D-1} = -\sum_{j=1}^{D} r_j. \tag{6.6}$$

In fact these coefficients are simply calculable in terms of the elementary symmetric polynomials $e_i(\cdot)$ on D variables [11, 12]:

$$c_{D-i} = (-1)^D\, e_i(r_j). \tag{6.7}$$

We see that it is the coefficient c_{n-1} that leads to a $1/r$ falloff in $\Delta(r)$ at large r, and so it is this coefficient that is proportional to the mass of the black hole. (By construction

$n \in \{1, \dots, D\}$, otherwise the mass of the black hole will be zero.) All of the other coefficients, (there are $D-1$ of them),

$$c_i : \qquad 0 \leq i \leq D-1; \qquad i \neq n-1, \tag{6.8}$$

will by construction be mass-independent. That is, in terms of the elementary symmetric polynomials, all the quantities

$$e_i(r_j) : \qquad 1 \leq i \leq D; \qquad i \neq D-n+1, \tag{6.9}$$

will be mass-independent. In terms of horizon areas, $A_i = 4\pi r_i^2$, all $D-1$ elementary symmetric polynomials

$$e_i\left(\sqrt{\frac{A_i}{4\pi}}\right) : \qquad 1 \leq i \leq D; \qquad i \neq D-n+1, \tag{6.10}$$

will be mass-independent. Of course not all the r_i need be physical (real and positive), so not all the A_i need be real. Since there are $D-1$ of these mass-independent quantities, it might sometimes be possible to eliminate all the unphysical (virtual) horizons r_i, and reduce the situation to one of dealing with a smaller number of real mass-independent quantities determined solely in terms of physical horizon areas. With N virtual horizons one will generally have $D-N-1$ mass independent quantities constructible in terms of physical horizons. Whether or not this can successfully be achieved in practice depends very much on the precise details of the polynomial $P(r)$. For example, as we have seen in the previous sections:

- Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetimes correspond to $D = 3$ and $N = 1$.

  There are two mass-independent quantities, [one trivial, equation (2.7), one non-trivial, equation (2.14)], but only one that depends solely on the physical horizons [equation (2.16) or equivalently (2.17)].

- Schwarzschild-anti-de Sitter spacetimes correspond to $D = 3$ and $N = 2$.

  There are two mass-independent quantities, [one trivial, equation (3.7), one non-trivial, equation (3.8)], but none that depend solely on the physical horizon.

- Reissner–Nordström–de Sitter spacetimes correspond to $D = 4$ and $N = 1$.

  There are three mass-independent quantities, [one trivial, equation (4.24), two non-trivial, equations (4.26) and (4.29)], but only two that depend solely on the physical horizons, [any two of equations (4.27), (4.31), and (4.32) — or the equivalent (4.34)].

- Reissner–Nordström-anti-de Sitter spacetimes correspond to $D = 4$ and $N = 2$.

  There are three mass-independent quantities, [one trivial, equation (5.10), two non-trivial, equations (5.11) and (5.13)], but only one that depends solely on the physical horizons, [any one of the equivalent equations (5.20), (5.21), or (5.22)].

But now we see that the key points of the preceding explicit discussion continue to hold in greater generality — whenever the Hawking–Israel/ Hernandez–Misner/ Misner–Sharp quasi-local mass $m(r)$ is any generic Laurent polynomial. Generalizations to higher dimensional spacetimes with hyper-spherical symmetry are immediate and straightforward. Generalizations to rotating black holes [13–17], and more complicated symmetries, is not quite as straightforward — but as long as the location of the horizons is determined by the roots of some Laurent polynomial we can expect similar results to hold.

7 Discussion

Generically, products of horizon areas may or may not be independent of the mass of the black hole. This depends on the precise form of the quasi-local mass, on whether one takes the product only over physical horizons, or whether one includes unphysical virtual horizons in the product. Generically, as long as the quasi-local mass is a Laurent polynomial with $D = D_{\text{max}} - D_{\text{min}}$, there will be D horizons from which one can construct $D - 1$ mass-independent quantities in terms of the elementary symmetric polynomials built out of the horizon radii. If N of these horizons are virtual (negative or complex radius), then by algebraically eliminating the virtual horizons there will generally be $D - N - 1$ (quite complicated) mass-independent quantities constructible solely in terms of the physical horizon radii (and hence constructible in terms of the physical horizon areas). We have explicitly checked these results for validity by investigating the situation for Schwarzschild-(anti-)de Sitter and Reissner–Nordström-(anti-)de Sitter spacetimes. As we have seen above, the general situation is much more complicated than currently envisaged.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Marsden Fund, and by a James Cook Fellowship, both administered by the Royal Society of New Zealand.

A Cubic polynomial equations

Consider a cubic polynomial equation in reduced form, with coefficients conveniently chosen to be

$$x^3 - 3p^2 x + 2q = 0; \qquad p > 0. \tag{A.1}$$

Then the exact roots are given by a form of Viète's trigonometric solution

$$x = 2p \, \sin\left\{\frac{1}{3} \, \sin^{-1}\left[\frac{q}{p^3}\right] + \epsilon \, \frac{2\pi}{3}\right\}; \qquad \epsilon \in \{0, \pm 1\}. \tag{A.2}$$

If $|q| < p^3$ there are three real roots.

On the other hand, if we have

$$x^3 + 3p^2 x - 2q = 0; \qquad p > 0, \tag{A.3}$$

then there is only one real root. It is given by a hyperbolic form of Viète's solution

$$x = 2p \, \sinh\left\{\frac{1}{3}\sinh^{-1}\left[\frac{q}{p^3}\right]\right\}. \tag{A.4}$$

In terms of Cardano's formulae one can explicitly rewrite this as

$$x = p\left\{\left[\sqrt{1+\frac{q^2}{p^6}} + \frac{q}{p^3}\right]^{1/3} - \left[\sqrt{1+\frac{q^2}{p^6}} - \frac{q}{p^3}\right]^{1/3}\right\}. \tag{A.5}$$

References

[1] M. Ansorg and J. Hennig, "The Inner Cauchy horizon of axisymmetric and stationary black holes with surrounding matter", Class. Quant. Grav. **25** (2008) 222001 [arXiv:0810.3998 [gr-qc]].

[2] M. Ansorg and J. Hennig, "The Inner Cauchy horizon of axisymmetric and stationary black holes with surrounding matter in Einstein-Maxwell theory", Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 221102 [arXiv:0903.5405 [gr-qc]].

[3] J. Hennig and M. Ansorg, "The Inner Cauchy horizon of axisymmetric and stationary black holes with surrounding matter in Einstein-Maxwell theory: Study in terms of soliton methods", Annales Henri Poincare **10** (2009) 1075 [arXiv:0904.2071 [gr-qc]].

[4] M. Ansorg, J. Hennig, and C. Cederbaum, "Universal properties of distorted Kerr-Newman black holes", Gen. Rel. Grav. **43** (2011) 1205 [arXiv:1005.3128 [gr-qc]].

[5] M. Cvetic, G. W. Gibbons, and C. N. Pope, "Universal Area Product Formulae for Rotating and Charged Black Holes in Four and Higher Dimensions", Phys. Rev. Lett. **106** (2011) 121301 [arXiv:1011.0008 [hep-th]].

[6] A. Castro and M. J. Rodriguez, “Universal properties and the first law of black hole inner mechanics”, arXiv:1204.1284 [hep-th].

[7] M. Visser, “Quantization of area for event and Cauchy horizons of the Kerr-Newman black hole”, arXiv:1204.3138 [gr-qc]; JHEP in press.

[8] M. Visser, “Dirty black holes: Thermodynamics and horizon structure”, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 2445 [hep-th/9203057].

[9] W. C. Hernandez and C. W. Misner, “Observer time as a coordinate in relativistic spherical hydrodynamics”, Astrophys. J. **143** (1966) 152.
[See especially equation (13).]

[10] C. W. Misner and D. H. Sharp, “Relativistic equations for adiabatic, spherically symmetric gravitational collapse”, Phys. Rev. **136** (1964) B571.

[11] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, 2nd edition. (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995) ISBN 0-19-850450-0 (paperback, 1998).

[12] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative Combinatorics*, Vol. 2. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995) ISBN 0-521-56069-1.

[13] R. P. Kerr, “Gravitational field of a spinning mass as an example of algebraically special metrics”, Physical Review Letters **11** (1963) 237–238.
doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.11.237.

[14] Ezra Newman and Allen Janis, “Note on the Kerr Spinning-Particle Metric”, Journal of Mathematical Physics **6** (1965) 915–917. doi:10.1063/1.1704350.

[15] Ezra Newman, K. Chinnapared, A. Exton, A. Prakash, and R. Torrence, “Metric of a Rotating, Charged Mass”, Journal of Mathematical Physics **6** (1965) 918–919.
doi:10.1063/1.1704351.

[16] D. L. Wiltshire, M. Visser, and S. M. Scott (editors), “The Kerr spacetime: Rotating black holes in general relativity”, (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[17] M. Visser, “The Kerr spacetime: A Brief introduction”, arXiv:0706.0622 [gr-qc].
Published in [16].